

REMARKS

Claims 6-13 are pending in this application. Claim 6 is independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 6 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner further rejected claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 6 asserting it includes subject matter which is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the element "subtracting said compressed unsharp image signal for the dodging treatment from each of said delayed input color image signals to generate processed image signals for dodging treatment" was not adequately described. The Examiner notes on page 15, lines 20-26, and page 13, lines 19-20 the processed image signals have already been through a dodging treatment. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions.

At the outset, by this amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to correct a typographical error on page 15, line 26 and has corrected the phrase “...subjected to the dodging treatment...” to “...subjected to the compression treatment...”. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is merely being made to correct a typographical error and does not constitute new matter.

It can be clearly seen in connection with Figure 1, as set forth on page 15, lines 20-26 that the adder 82 subtracts the image signals output from the LUT 78 from the image signals output from the DLY 75. In other words, adder 82 subtracts the unsharp image signals generated by FIL 76 from the image signals subjected to color correction at matrix 72, the combination of the image signals having been subjected to the color correction with the unsharp image signals having been subjected to the compression treatment thus permitting a dodging effect to be applied to output image signals.

Similarly on page 18, line 22 through page 19, line 8, the specification clearly provides that luminance image signals are generated at the MTX 74 and converted into unsharp image signals at the FIL 76. The obtained unsharp image signals are subjected to the dynamic range compression treatment at the LUT 78 and input to the adder 82 for the dodging treatment.

Based upon the citation set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the correction to the specification on page 15 conforms to the rest of the disclosure set forth in the specification and the accompanying drawings. As such, Applicant maintains that the correction does not constitute new matter.

Further, based upon the descriptions set forth above, Applicant maintains that the invention as set forth in claim 6 is sufficiently described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

In addition, by this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 6 to more appropriately recite the present invention. Based upon the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn. As claims 7-13 were rejected as being dependent on rejected claim 6, Applicant further requests that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 6 asserting that it is unclear how the unsharp image signal is being generated during the time the input color signals are being delayed to generate the luminance image signal.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 6 to recite, *inter alia*, at least one memory for delaying the input color image signals for a time period corresponding to a delayed time which occurs as a result of processing the first line thereby generating delayed input color image signals. Support for this claim amendment can be found in the citations noted above and can clearly be seen at least in connection with Figure 1. Based upon this amendment, Applicants respectfully submits that claim 6 particularly points and distinctly claims the

subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

As claims 7-13 were rejected based upon a rejection of claim 6, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant respectfully petitions for a two (2) month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). A check in the amount of \$450.00 in payment of the extension of time fee is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
for Marc S. Weiner, #32,181
40,439

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MSW/CMV:trb
1110-0289P